

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 30, 2009. Claims 1 to 7, 19 and 20 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 19 and 20 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 7, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,047,955 (Shope) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,671,066 (Aikawa). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

The claims herein generally concern transmitting a document from a data processing apparatus to a printing device, wherein the document is formed by a plurality of logical pages, and printing pages for each of a plurality of sets. In particular, a plurality of logical pages for each of a plurality of sets is spooled. A number of spooled logical pages is derived. The derived number of logical pages is fewer than an entirety of the spooled logical pages, and the derived number of logical pages corresponds to numerical factors of a total number of spooled logical pages. One logical page, identical in drawing information to a first logical page, is retrieved from among the derived number logical pages. Drawing information from the first logical page to a logical page just previous to the one retrieved logical page is determined to be drawing information for one of the plurality of sets. A print command to be transmitted to a printing device based on the drawing information for the one determined set is generated and transmitted to the printing device.

Thus, the drawing information of the first logical page is compared with a derived number of logical pages that is fewer than an entirety of the spooled logical pages.

For example, if the number of logical pages in the document is 20, the numerical factors of the number 20 are 2, 4, 5, 10 and 20. Therefore, the derived number of logical pages might be only five logical pages (corresponding to the five numbered pages 2, 4, 5, 10 and 20), which is fewer in number than the entirety of all 20 spooled logical pages. Thus, the claimed arrangement may retrieve the one logical page more efficiently, since the number of logical pages to be compared is reduced.

Applicant submits that the applied references, alone or in any permissible combination, are not seen to disclose or to suggest the foregoing arrangement, particularly the features of deriving a number of spooled logical pages, wherein the derived number of logical pages is fewer than an entirety of the spooled logical pages, and wherein the derived number of logical pages corresponds to numerical factors of a total number of the spooled logical pages, and retrieving, from among the derived number of logical pages one logical page identical in drawing information to a first logical page.

Shope is seen to disclose storing rasterized signals of multi-page documents so that a plurality of electronically collated, multi-page sets can be printed without re-rasterization. Shope is seen to disclose an electronic collation means for presenting the stored image data for printing in the proper sequence, as often as is needed to produce the desired number of collated document sets, whereby a plurality of electronically collated, multi-page sets can be printed without re-rasterization. See Shope, column 3, lines 9 to 14.

However, Shope is believed to be silent on deriving a number of spooled logical pages, wherein the derived number of logical pages is fewer than an entirety of the spooled logical pages, and wherein the derived number of logical pages corresponds to numerical factors of a total number of the spooled logical pages, and retrieving, from

among the derived number of logical pages one logical page identical in drawing information to a first logical page.

Therefore, Shope is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of deriving a number of spooled logical pages, wherein the derived number of logical pages is fewer than an entirety of the spooled logical pages, and wherein the derived number of logical pages corresponds to numerical factors of a total number of the spooled logical pages, and retrieving, from among the derived number of logical pages one logical page identical in drawing information to a first logical page.

At page 4, the Office Action concedes that “Shope does not disclose expressly retrieval means for retrieving, from among the plurality of logical pages spooled in said spooling means, one logical page identical in drawing information to a first logical page and wherein said retrieval means retrieves the one logical page by discriminating a logical page corresponding to numerical factors of the plurality of logical pages.” The Office Action therefore asserts that Aikawa discloses these features from column 13, line 38, to column 14, line 38. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the assertion that the cited portions of Aikawa disclose these features.

Aikawa is seen to disclose processing print data, in which one job consists of multiple sets of prints data with no break. Aikawa discloses the following:

“This process makes it clear whether each of the pages starting with the second page received from the printer driver is identical to the first page”. See column 13, lines 51 to 53, of Aikawa.

Thus, Aikawa is seen to compare print data of a first page with print data of each of the second to last pages.

On the other hand, the claims define a comparison of drawing information of a first logical page with drawing information of a derived number of logical pages that is fewer than an entirety of the spooled logical pages. The derived number of logical pages corresponds to numerical factors of a total number of spooled logical pages.

In contrast, Aikawa is seen to compare print data of a first page with print data of each of the other pages. Aikawa is therefore believed to be silent as to a comparison between a first logical page and a derived number of logical pages that is fewer than an entirety of the spooled logical pages.

Thus, Aikawa is believed to be silent on deriving a number of spooled logical pages, wherein the derived number of logical pages is fewer than an entirety of the spooled logical pages, and wherein the derived number of logical pages corresponds to numerical factors of a total number of the spooled logical pages, and retrieving, from among the derived number of logical pages one logical page identical in drawing information to a first logical page.

Therefore, Aikawa is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of deriving a number of spooled logical pages, wherein the derived number of logical pages is fewer than an entirety of the spooled logical pages, and wherein the derived number of logical pages corresponds to numerical factors of a total number of the spooled logical pages, and retrieving, from among the derived number of logical pages one logical page identical in drawing information to a first logical page.

Accordingly, the applied references, alone or in any permissible combination, are not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of deriving a number of spooled logical pages, wherein the derived number of logical pages is fewer than an

entirety of the spooled logical pages, and wherein the derived number of logical pages corresponds to numerical factors of a total number of the spooled logical pages, and retrieving, from among the derived number of logical pages one logical page identical in drawing information to a first logical page.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 19 and 20, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to recite subject matter that would not have been obvious from the applied art, and are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due. However, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Shant Tchakerian #61,825/
Shant H. Tchakerian
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 61,825

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 3582614v1